IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPUR : M.P.

Misc. Petition No. 1344 of 1991

Division Bench (Civil)

Petitioners: (1) Koyla Shramik Sabha,
Through its General Secretary,
Shri B.N. ~~Shrivastava~~ Singh,
Korba, Distt. Bilaspur, M.P.

(2) Ram Iqbal Thakur, aged about
24 years, s/o Shri Vashisth Thakur,
r/o Korba, Tahsil, Korba,
District Bilaspur, M.P.

Versus

Respondents: (1) The Union of India through
the Secretary, Ministry of Coal
and Energy, New Delhi.

(2) Chairman,
Coal India Limited,
10, Netaji Subhash Road,
Calcutta (W.B.).

(3) The Management of
South Eastern Coalfields Limited,
Seepat Road,
Bilaspur, M.P.

(4) Director (Personnel),
South Eastern Coalfields Ltd.,
Seepat Road,
Bilaspur, M.P.

(5) General Manager,
South Eastern Coalfields Ltd.,
Korba, Tah. Korba,
District Bilaspur, M.P.

(6) Keep Right
(a concern) through its Proprietor,
Shri Dhillon, Contractor and
Supplier of Security Guards, 'D-Type
Quarter, Kusmunda, Tahsil Korba,
District Bilaspur, M.P.

(7) Chief Labour Commissioner,
Shram Shakti Bhawan,
Rafi Marg, New Delhi.

PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR WRITS IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION ETC. AND FOR APPROPRIATE FURTHER DIRECTIONS

The petitioners above named beg to submit as under:

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

W.P. No. 1344/91

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	05-12-2005 None appears for the petitioners. Shri P.S.Koshy, learned counsel appears for the respondents No. 2 to 5. None for the others. The matter was taken up for hearing earlier on two occasions i.e. on 21-06-2005 & 16-08-2005, none appeared for the petitioner & respondent No. 6. On 21-06-2005, S.P.C. was issued to the petitioner as well as to the respondent No. 6 to enter appearance either in person or through Advocate for hearing on 26th July, 2005. On 16-08-2005, notice was issued from Court side to the petitioners as well as to the respondent No. 6 for a date to be fixed by the office stating that the matter has been received on transfer from High Court of Madhya Pradesh. The matter was called for hearing twice. On both the occasions, neither any counsel appeared on behalf of petitioner & respondent No.6 nor any representation was made. In the circumstances, the petition is dismissed for want of prosecution. Sd/- SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI Judge	

Thmane

8/12/05

[पी